Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|------------------|--|
| 10/560,262 | ZATLOUKAL ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| DANIEL WALSH | 2887 | |

| | DANIEL WALSH | 2887 | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------------------------|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 31 August 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | |
| M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited (with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | which places the r (3) a Request | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(| | FIRST REPLY WAS FI | LED WITHIN TWO | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.138(a) and the appropriate extension fee aware been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of he fee. The appropriate extension fee nader 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et of thin (a) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, nay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | nsideration and/or search (see NOT | | cause | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet | | ducing or simplifying t | ne issues for | | |
| appeal; and/or (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a d | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | |
| Interest and the same of the compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all | | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the | | |
| non-allowable claim(s). | | • | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | I be entered and an e | xplanation of | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-40</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome all rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. | | |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu | t does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: | | |
| | | | | | |
| Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (X Other: see NOTE below. | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

/DANIEL WALSH/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2887

NOTE:

Claims 1-40 remain rejected as per the final office action (mail date 6-22-10). The Amendment will not be entered because it is non-compliant (see attached PTO-324) and it is unclear if the version of the claims is proper/correct.

The Examienr notes that the status identifier of claim 1 is "Currently Amended" but there does not appear to be any amendments in the claim (claim is not marked up). The Applicants response also indicates claim amendemnts were made to claim 1, but claim 1 is not marked up (does not show any amendments).

Further, the Examiner notes that the circuitry in Zalewski si intpereted to consitute a transceiver(communication sections of the phone). However, the device itself can be interpreted as a transceiver, as well. Further, Pertitia still teaches a common transceiver, since it recites "although it is possible in some implementation". This is not believed to be teaching away as argued by the Applicant. The Examiner suggests reconsideration of such arguments by the Applicant with filing a corrected response.